

Penkovsky Reaction

I share your regrets over the obtuseness of the Soviet authorities in matters pertaining to freedom of the press. Obviously, you are under no obligation to show a "correct" point of view and are even perfectly at liberty to print anything that fills the empty spaces between chuck roast ads. However, it is regrettable that the expulsion of your able and amiable Moscow correspondent should have resulted from the publication of so unworthy material as *The Penkovsky Papers*.

At best, the papers are worthless as a source of insight into Soviet intentions; at worst, they tend to arouse the suspicions of the Soviet authorities that the timing of the publication was "not accidental."

The issue is not really the authenticity of the papers (although I personally consider them, on the internal evidence of the text, a rather substantial forgery or a doctored version of oral remarks by Penkovsky recorded on tape by his London contacts). The business of spies is to forward factual information and leave analysis to others. As Edward Crankshaw so ably pointed out in the remarks which you used as a scanty foil for the papers, Penkovsky confused capabilities with intentions, a cardinal sin in intelligence analysis. The *Papers* also confuse contingency reasoning with evidence of planning. It is interesting and important to know that there exists somewhere in Moscow a staff paper arguing the merits of surprise attack or preventive war or bacteriological warfare. Such contingency papers are produced by the dozens in Washington and

elsewhere and they are the legitimate province of strategic military thinking. But it is the business of political analysts to assign to them the exact weight they deserve.

The publication of the *Papers* comes at a time when the Soviet Union is in an extremely delicate position with respect to the outside world, pressured by the Chinese as virtually a lackey of Wall Street and at the same time charged with responsibility for real or imaginary disturbances in places far removed from Moscow's influence. It takes little to generate in the minds of the Soviet leaders the notion that "someone" was trying deliberately to complicate still further the otherwise delicate relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

It would, of course, be of help if the Soviet leaders or their advisers knew more about the free-wheeling habits of the American publishing industry. At the very least, the customary delay between the acceptance of a manuscript and its actual appearance in print should seriously impair the "curious timing" theory. On the other hand, once the editors of *The Washington Post* have digested their indignation, they might take some time to ponder this friendly suggestion: The publication of drivel, while admittedly a matter of right—is not the best way of discharging the precious responsibilities of a free press.

SAMUEL L. SHARP,
Professor of International Relations,
American University,
Washington.

12/3/65 WP

The Penkovsky Papers

On Monday, *The Washington Post* will print, as scheduled, the concluding installment of syndicated excerpts from the book *The Penkovsky Papers*. They have aroused a great deal of discussion among American and British experts on Soviet affairs with competent opinion divided as to the form in which the papers were released and as to the extent to which they were wholly in the words of Penkovsky. No one has challenged the essential point that Penkovsky was for a time a spectacularly successful intelligence source of the West.

It would not be conceivable that responsible newspapers in this country would suppress notice of a book of this significance in history or of such consequence in foreign affairs. *The Washington Post*, as one of the newspapers which have published excerpts from the papers, has unsuccessfully solicited criticism and comment on them from the Soviet Embassy and will publish Monday a critique by Victor Zorza of the *Manchester Guardian*, who doubts that the papers originated in the form in which they are presented in the book and who suspects the intrusion of material not originating with Penkovsky. No doubt this will long remain an interesting subject of conjecture and speculation, and *The Washington Post* will try to present opposing views as they appear.

The readers of this newspaper should know that *The Washington Post's* Moscow correspondent was summoned to the Soviet Foreign Ministry at 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon and told that "we expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such kind will be published in *The Washington Post* in the future." He was further told that "if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures."

What those measures are we cannot know. They will not cause *The Washington Post* to alter its intent regarding this series of articles or any subsequent publication. We refuse to accept the inadmissible suggestion that this newspaper must not print material which the Soviet government may find unacceptable.

It will fulfill its responsibilities as it sees them, whatever "necessary measures" of intimidation and censorship Moscow undertakes to prevent it. Newspapers in the United States, the Soviet government should know by this time, are not to be told by governments, either foreign or domestic, what they "must" print or "must not" print.

MRS. WYNNE CALLS ON BRITISH AMBASSADOR IN MOSCOW

Moscow, Dec. 16.—Mrs. Sheila Wynne, wife of Mr. Greville Wynne, today called on the British Ambassador here, Sir Humphrey Trevelyan. An Embassy spokesman said no meeting had yet been arranged between Mrs. Wynne and her husband, who has been accused of espionage.

Mrs. Wynne is staying with the British consul, Mr. Kenneth Kirby, and his wife. On her arrival yesterday Mrs. Wynne said she would like to see Mr. Khrushchev and ask him to free her husband, a businessman arrested in Hungary on November 2 and extradited to the Soviet Union. It is not known whether Mr. Wynne is in Moscow.

Today's edition of the Soviet weekly *Nedelya* published photographs of Mr. Wynne and five American embassy officials alleged by Soviet newspapers to have been linked with Oleg Penkovsky, a Soviet scientific official whose arrest as a "spy" for Britain and the United States was announced last Tuesday.

It said Mr. Wynne came to Moscow in July and August, 1961, to visit the British Fair and the French Exhibition, but "in reality the lover of exhibitions on each visit met Penkovsky, gave him instructions and received from him espionage information."

CODE MESSAGES

Pravda said today that Penkovsky was "money-grabbing, greedy and avaricious." At home, Penkovsky hid from his own family and was afraid of giving himself away by an involuntary word in

his sleep. At the appointed time, he listened on his portable receiver to transmissions in code from Frankfurt am Main (west Germany)."

Russia yesterday accused three more American diplomats of complicity in the alleged spy ring. *Pravda* and *Nedelya* named the men as Captain Alexis Davison, aged 31, an Air Force officer, who is the Embassy's doctor, Mr. Robert German, aged 35, and Mr. Hugh Montgomery, aged 39.

Pravda said Penkovsky marked a Moscow lamp post with a piece of coal to indicate that information was ready for collection, and said a dark stain on the door of a fish shop meant it had been picked up.

"RED-HANDED"

The *Pravda* article, headed "Caught Red-handed", was accompanied by a picture purporting to show Captain Davison standing by a lamp post which carried the secret coal mark.

It said Mr. Richard Jacob, a United States Embassy secretary, asked to leave Russia early last month, was also implicated in the ring, and said Penkovsky also had "direct links" with Mr. Rodney Carlson, an American diplomat who voluntarily left the Soviet Union yesterday.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 16.—The State Department said yesterday that allegations of espionage made against three United States Embassy officials in Moscow were "completely unfounded". —Reuter.

12/16/65 p. 10 Washington Post

12/17/65 LT

11/14/65 WP